BELLOTA PECKHAM & PECKHAM, 1892 (ARANEAE; SALTICIDAE) PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE SPECIES UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS. Z.N.(S.) 2294

By María Elena Galiano *(Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales "Bernardino Rivadavia", Av. Angel Gallardo 470, Buenos Aires, Argentina)*

The present case concerns the misidentification of the type species of a genus by the original authors of the generic name, which should be corrected under Articles 67j and 70a. When G.W. Peckham & E.G. Peckham established the new genus *Bellota* (1892: 67) they designated as type species *Chirothecia? formicina* Taczanowski, 1879, in the new combination *Bellota formicina.* They redescribed the species using a male from Venezuela which was sent to them by E. Simon, now kept at the Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard. A female of the same lot, identified by the Peckhams as *Bellota formicina,* is now at the Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris.

2. When the genus *Bellota* was revised (Galiano, 1972), I followed the Peckhams' criteria, but I have since examined many specimens collected near the type locality (Luchugal, Peru) and have identified them as *Chirothecia formicina* Taczanowski, 1879 (: 367–368) by comparison with the holotype (an immature female kept in the Zoological Institute, Academy of Sciences, Warsaw). It is clear that the Peckhams made a mistake when identifying Taczanowski's species. The species from Venezuela which the Peckhams saw was given a new name: *Bellota peckhami* Galiano, 1978 (: 27. See also Peckham & Peckham, 1892: 68; Simon, 1901: 529, 531, 534; Galiano, 1972 (part): 465, 467, 473, 475, figs. 11, 12, 43, 51).

3. Although specifically distinct from *Bellota peckhami* Galiano, 1978, *Chirothecia formicina* Taczanowski, 1879 belongs to the same genus, so should retain its name *Bellota formicina* (Taczanowski, 1879) (*non sensu* Peckham & Peckham, 1892).

4. The misidentification of the type species of *Bellota* having been demonstrated, it is for the Commission to designate a type species, choosing between three possibilities according to the Code, Article 70: (i) the nominal species actually involved, which was wrongly named in the type designation, in this case *Bellota peckhami* Galiano, 1978; or (ii) if the identity of that species is doubtful, a species chosen in conformity with the usage of the generic name prevailing at the time the misidentification is

discovered, but we are not dealing with such a case, because *Bellota peckhami* has been described and illustrated, its holotype can be studied at the Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard, and its identity is not in doubt; or (iii) the species named by the designator, regardless of the misidentification, in this case *Chirothecia formicina* Taczanowski, 1879.

5. I have carefully weighed the pros and cons of possibilities (i) and (iii) and consider that the first will best serve the identification and delimitation of the genus *Bellota* Peckham & Peckham, because the authors took the characteristics of their genus from the specimen they had in front of them, namely the holotype of *B. peckhami,* and not from the original material of *C. formicina.*

6. Although the two species have up till now been considered, and still are considered, congeneric, they differ in characteristics that involve some important structures. Further investigations might demonstrate that they are not congeneric. Let us assume that *Chirothecia formicina* is designated as the type species of *Bellota.* Now, supposing that a zoologist (having concluded that the two species are not congeneric) establishes a new genus and designates *Bellota peckhami* as the type species, he would then subjectively associate his new genus with one specimen, viz. the holotype of *Bellota peckhami* on which the Peckhams based their genus *Bellota.* Such a situation might cause great confusion. As the first taxonomic reviser of that genus, I believe that the designation of *Bellota peckhami* Galiano, 1978, as the type species of *Bellota* will contribute to the best comprehension of the genus.

7. The International Commission on Zoòlogical Nomenclature is therefore requested:

(1) to use its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species for the nominal genus *Bellota* Peckham & Peckham, 1892, hitherto made and to designate *Bellota peckhami* Galiano, 1978 as type species of that genus;

(2) to place the generic name *Bellota* Peckham & Peckham, 1892 (gender: feminine), type species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Bellota peckhami* Galiano, 1978, on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology;

(3) to place the specific name *peckhami* Galiano, 1978, as published in the binomen *Bellota peckhami* (specific name of the type species of *Bellota* Peckham & Peckham, 1892) on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology;

(4) to place the specific name *formicina* Taczanowski, 1879, as published in the binomen *Chirothecia*

formicina, on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.

REFERENCES

GALIANO, M.E. 1972. Salticidae (Araneae) formiciformes. XIII. Revisión del género *Bellota* Peckham, 1892. *Physis*, vol. 31 (83): 463–484.

———— 1978. Fauna desértico-costera peruana. V. Dos especies de Salticidae (Araneae) de Piura. *Rev. peruana Entomol.*, vol. 21 (1): 27–30.

PECKHAM, G.W. & PECKHAM, E.G. 1892. Ant-like spiders of the Family Attidae. *Occas. Pap. nat. Hist. Soc. Wisconsin*, vol. 2: 1–83.

SIMON, E. 1897-1903. *Histoire naturelle des Araignées*, vol. 2: 1–1080.

TACZANOWSKI, L. 1879. Les aranéides du Pérou. *Bull. Soc. imp. Nat. Moscou*, vol. 53 (4): 278–374.